



REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected the claims 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The applicant has canceled claims 20 and 21. Claim 19 has been amended so that it now reads as an independent claim and it is clearly indicated that the memory device can store data in form of a recorded message. This allows the reader to customize his or her own messages.

The Examiner stated that the earlier argument provided by the applicant did not convince the Examiner that the amended claims were different from the prior art. Furthermore, the Examiner wrote: "While differences are explained in the argument they do not appear in the claims. Claims 19-21, partly attempt to provide the differences, but not contain definite language to overcome the art of record." The applicant believes, that amending claim 19 as indicated above and by canceling all the other claims the invention claimed is differentiated from the prior art.

Claims 1-18, and 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Leung (5.569,868). The applicant has canceled these claims.

RECEIVED
AUG 29 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800



CONCLUSIONS

By virtue of the amendments the applicant believes that this application is deemed patentable over the cited art. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsiders and withdraws his rejections and allows this application to pass to issue. Alternatively, the applicant requests that this amendment be entered for the purpose of appeal.

John Dodds

Attorney of the Applicant

Reg. No. 45533

Cc. File

Ms. Linda Iloba

RECEIVED
AUG 29 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800